S
796.5
F2mrs
V.1
1982

PLEASE RETURN

MADISON RIVER RECREATION STUDY
SUMMARY TABLES FOR
BEAR TRAP CANYON USERS

STATE DOCUMENTS COLLECTION

JUN 23 1983

MONTANA STATE LIBRARY
1515 E. 6th AVE.
HELENA, MONTANA 59620

JAN 1 1 1984
APR 1 1984
JUL 3 1991
MAY 1 3 1992
JUN 3 0 2000

MONTANA STATE LIBRARY
S 796.5 F2mrs 1982? c.1 v.1
Madison River recreation study :use seas
3 0864 00044582 8

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
Montana State Library

https://archive.org/details/madisonriverrecr1982unit

MADISON RIVER RECREATION STUDY

SUMMARY TABLES FOR RECREATIONAL USERS OF THE BEAR TRAP CANYON

USE SEASON - SUMMER 1981

COOPERATING PARTIES

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY
NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
DENTON, TEXAS 76203

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
BUTTE DISTRICT
P.O. BOX 3388
BUTTE, MONTANA 59701

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH
WILDLIFE AND PARKS
REGION 3
8695 HUFFINE ROAD
BOZEMAN, MONTANA 59715

INTRODUCTION

The Madison River Recreation Project was a cooperative research effort involving the U.S.D.I. Bureau of Land Management, Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, and North Texas State University. The objective of the study was to obtain information on recreational use and visitor attitudes toward management techniques on the Madison River, Montana.

This report summarizes the response to both an on-site and follow-up mail survey of visitors to the Madison River during the summer use season (May-August) 1981.

During that period 350 Bear Trap Canyon users were contacted and subsequently sent a detailed questionnaire. Of that group, 342 received the questionnaire and 243 returned useable questionnaires for a 71% response rate. Four user groups are represented within the 243 returned questionnaires: bank fishermen, float fishermen, recreational boaters, and trail users.

This report is organized into a series of tables which summarize user response to the on-site registration card and questionnaire. Each user group listed above will have a separate section within this report. The number of respondents per groups in 111 bank fishermen, 24 float fishermen, 67 recreational boaters, and 41 trail users.

BANK FISHERMEN

TABLE OF CONTENTS
for Bank Fishermen

SUBJECT TABLE NUMBER

PART I CHARACTERISTICS OF RIVER TRIP AND VISITORS

State of Residence 1
Month Respondent Contacted 2
Location of Interview 3
Equipment Ownership 4
Group Size 5
Camping on River 6
Campsite Location 7
Respondents First River Visit 8
Frequency of Visitation 9
Length of River Visit 10

PART II PERCEPTIONS OF CROWDING

Estimated Number of People Seen by Bank Fishermen
  Bank Fishermen Observed 11A
  Float Fishermen Observed 11B
  Recreational Boaters Observed 11C
  Trail Users Observed 11D
  Campus Observed 11E
Expectations of Meeting Other Users 12
Desired Encounter Levels With Other Users 13

PART III USER PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS, MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES, CONFLICTS AND SATISFACTION

Problems Experienced During River Visit 14
Open Ended Responses To Problems 14A
Attitudes Toward Management Alternatives 15
Observed Conflicts Between User Groups 16
Types and Causes of Conflicts Observed 17
User Satisfaction 18

PART IV BANK FISHERMEN PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS AND MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES

Problems Experienced by Fishermen 19
Open Ended Response to Problems 19A
Attitudes Toward Fishery Management Alternatives 20

SUBJECT TABLE NUMBER

PART V PERCEPTIONS OF BEAR TRAP CANYON MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Status of Bear Trap Canyon Trail 21
Status of Bear Trap Creek Cabin 22
First Visit to BEar Trap Canyon 23
Frequency of Visitation 24
Number of Trips to Roadless Area 25
Length of Bear Trap Visit 26
Seasonal Visits to Bear Trap Canyon 27

PART VI SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

Level of Education 28
Age of Respondent 29
Gender of Respondent 30

PART I

CHARACTERISTICS OF RIVER TRIP AND RIVER VISITORS

TABLE 1
STATE OF RESIDENCE FOR RESPONDENT

State	# of Respondents
Montana	81
California	4
Colorado	4
Idaho	4
Pennsylvania	3
Texas	2
Utah	2
Wisconsin	2
Arkansas	1
Delaware	1
Illinois	1
Indiana	1
Minnesota	1
Nebraska	1
New Jersey	1
Ohio	1
Washington	1

TABLE 2
MONTH RESPONDENT CONTACTED ON-SITE

Month	Frequency	Percent
May	17	15.3
June	63	56.7
July	21	18.9
August	10	9.0
	111	100.0

TABLE 3
LOCATION OF INTERVIEW

Location	Frequency	Percent
Warm Springs	39	35.1
Trail Head	72	64.9
	111	100.0

TABLE 4
EQUIPMENT OWNERSHIP

Ownership	Frequency	Percent
Commercially Outfitted	0	0.0
Rented	0	0.0
Privately Outfitted	111	100.0
	111	100.0

TABLE 5
GROUP SIZE

Group Size	Frequency	Percent
1-2	66	59.5
3-4	34	30.6
5-9	10	9.0
10+	1	.9
	111	100.0

TABLE 6
CAMPING ON RIVER

Camping	Frequency	Percent
Yes	18	16.2
No	93	83.8
	111	100.0

TABLE 7
CAMPSITE LOCATION

Red Mountain	2	12.4
Log Cabin	4	25.0
Trail Head	8	50.0
Access Point	1	6.3
Bear Trap	1	6.3
	16	100.0

TABLE 8
RESPONDENTS FIRST VISIT TO MADISON RIVER

First Visit	Frequency	Percent
Yes	15	13.5
No	96	86.5
	111	100.0

TABLE 9
FREQUENCY OF VISITATION PER YEAR

Number of Visits	Frequency	Percent
1	14	14.7
2	7	7.4
3	8	8.5
4	11	11.6
5	12	12.6
6-10	43	45.2
11+	-	--
	95	100.0

TABLE 10
LENGTH OF RIVER VISIT

Days	Frequency	Percent
1	65	59.7
2	19	17.5
3-5	25	22.8
	109	100.0

PART II

PERCEPTIONS OF CROWDING

TABLE 12
EXPECTATIONS OF MEETING OTHER USERS

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Far Fewer Than Expected	1
Fewer Than Expected	2
About What I Expected	3
More Than I Expected	4
Far More Than Expected	5
Had no Expectations	6

TABLE 13
DESIRED ENCOUNTER LEVELS WITH OTHER USERS

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Alot More People	1
A Few More People	2
Neither Fewer Nor More People	3
A Few Less People	4
Far Fewer People	5

TABLE 11A
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY BANK FISHERMEN

BANK FISHERMEN OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	2	2.2
1-2	12	13.5
3-5	22	24.7
6-10	33	37.1
11-15	8	8.9
16-20	3	3.5
21-25	5	5.6
26-50	3	3.4
51+	1	1.1
Mean 9.6	89	100.0
St. Dev. 11.6		

TABLE 11B
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY BANK FISHERMEN

FLOAT FISHERMEN OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	31	37.3
1-2	10	12.0
3-5	15	18.2
6-10	14	16.9
11-15	5	6.0
16-20	2	2.1
21-25	1	1.3
26-50	4	4.9
51+	1	1.3
Mean 7.0	83	100.0
St. Dev. 14.2		

TABLE 11C
ESTIMATED NUMBER PEOPLE SEEN BY BANK FISHERMEN

RECREATIONAL BOATERS OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	45	54.9
1-2	5	6.2
3-5	9	11.0
6-10	7	8.6
11-15	5	6.0
16-20	1	1.2
21-25	2	2.4
26-50	7	8.5
51+	1	1.2
Mean 7.5	82	100.0
St. Dev. 15.7		

TABLE 11D
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY BANK FISHERMEN

TRAIL USERS OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	19	22.4
1-2	13	15.3
3-5	21	24.7
6-10	18	21.2
11-15	10	11.7
16-20	1	1.2
21-25	3	3.5
26-50	-	--
51+	-	--
Mean 5.6	85	100.0
St. Dev. 5.9		

TABLE 11E
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY BANK FISHERMEN

CAMPERS OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	19	43.2
1-2	3	6.8
3-5	4	9.1
6-10	9	20.5
11-15	3	6.8
16-20	-	--
21-25	2	4.5
26-50	3	6.8
51+	1	2.3
Mean 8.6	44	100.0

St. Dev. 16.7

TABLE 12
EXPECTATIONS OF MEETING OTHER USERS

	How Did the Number of People Seen Compare to Your Expectations														
Group or Location	Far fewer than expected		Fewer than expected		About what I expected		More than I expected		Far more than expected		Had no expectations		Totals		Mean* Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Bank Fishermen	7	8.0	16	18.4	46	52.4	8	9.4	8	9.4	2	2.4	87	100.0	2.93
Float Fishermen	9	10.7	16	19.1	30	35.7	16	19.1	7	8.3	6	7.1	84	100.0	2.33
Recreational Boaters	10	12.5	14	17.5	22	22.7	13	16.3	10	12.5	6	13.7	75	100.0	2.99
Trail Users	10	13.7	9	12.3	40	54.8	6	8.2	3	4.1	5	6.8	73	100.0	2.75
People at Campsite	7	17.5	7	17.5	13	32.5	4	10.0	3	7.5	6	15.0	40	100.0	2.08

* Category "Had no expectations" was not used in calculating Mean Score.

TABLE 13
DESIRED ENCOUNTER LEVELS WITH OTHER USERS

	Would Like To Have Seen												
Group or Location	A lot more people		A few more people		Neither fewer nor more people		A few less people		Far fewer people		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Bank Fishermen	0	0.0	4	4.4	59	65.6	17	18.9	10	11.1	90	100.0	3.36
Float Fishermen	0	0.0	8	9.5	51	60.7	15	17.8	10	11.9	84	100.0	3.32
Recreational Boaters	0	0.0	4	5.0	42	52.4	17	21.3	17	21.3	80	100.0	3.58
Trail Users	0	0.0	7	9.4	47	63.5	14	18.9	6	8.1	74	100.0	3.25
People at Campsites	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	56.4	11	28.2	6	15.4	39	100.0	2.58

PART III

USER PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS, MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES, CONFLICTS, AND SATISFACTION

TABLE 14

PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED DURING RIVER VISIT

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Not A Problem	1
Slight Problem	2
Moderate Problem	3
Serious Problem	4
Very Serious Problem	5

TABLE 15

ATTITUDES TOWARD MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Strongly Oppose	1
Oppose	2
Neither Support nor Oppose	3
Support	4
Strongly Support	5

TABLE 16

OBSERVED CONFLICTS BETWEEN USER GROUPS

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
No Conflict Observed	1
Slight Conflict	2
Moderate Conflict	3
Serious Conflict	4
Very Serious Conflict	5

TABLE 18

USER SATISFACTION WITH RIVER TRIP

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Strongly Disagree	1
Disagree	2
Neither Agree of Disagree	3
Agree	4
Strongly Agree	5

TABLE 14
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED DURING RIVER VISIT

Problem Experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very serious problem		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Litter in or along a river	39	35.1	43	38.8	24	21.6	5	4.5	0	0.0	111	100.0	1.95
Obstructions in river (logs, limbs, fences)	90	82.6	12	11.0	6	5.5	1	0.9	0	0.0	109	100.0	1.24
Too few drinking water sources	58	53.2	29	26.6	15	13.8	7	6.4	0	0.0	109	100.0	1.73
Too many homes or cottages along the river	85	77.3	15	13.6	7	6.4	1	0.9	2	1.8	110	100.0	1.36
Off-road vehicles in river area	71	64.5	22	20.0	5	4.5	8	7.3	4	3.6	110	100.0	1.65
People being inconsiderate or making noise	72	65.5	17	15.5	15	13.6	5	4.5	1	0.9	110	100.0	1.60
Too many people floating on the river	57	51.8	15	13.6	20	18.2	8	7.3	10	9.1	110	100.0	2.08
Motorized boats on the river	94	86.2	6	5.5	3	2.8	2	1.8	4	3.7	109	100.0	1.31

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very Serious problem		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Utility poles and lines	94	85.5	11	10.0	4	3.6	0	0.0	1	0.9	110	100.0	1.20
Too many commercial establishments	99	90.8	4	3.7	5	4.6	0	0.0	1	0.9	109	100.0	1.16
Inadequate toilet facilities at put-in and take-out points	63	58.9	21	19.6	14	13.1	4	3.7	5	4.7	107	100.0	1.75
Too few toilet facilities along river between put-in and take-out points	73	69.5	16	15.2	10	9.5	3	2.9	3	2.9	105	100.0	1.54
Not enough law enforcement	85	78.7	9	8.3	8	7.4	2	1.9	4	3.7	108	100.0	1.43
Too much law enforcement	107	97.3	0	0.0	1	0.9	0	0.0	2	1.8	110	100.0	1.09
Roads within sight of river	88	80.0	16	14.5	6	5.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	110	100.0	1.25
Low flying aircraft	106	96.4	2	1.8	1	0.9	1	0.9	0	0.0	110	100.0	1.06

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very Serious problem		Totals		Mean scores
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Too many signs along river	103	93.6	6	5.5	0	0.0	1	0.9	0	0.0	110	100.0	1.08
Too few signs along river	103	93.6	3	2.7	2	1.8	1	0.9	1	0.9	110	100.0	1.12
Inconsiderate bank fishermen	98	89.9	6	5.5	4	3.7	1	0.9	0	0.0	109	100.0	1.15
Inadequate information services (sign displays) at put-in points	81	75.0	18	16.7	6	5.5	2	1.9	1	0.9	108	100.0	1.37
Livestock	94	86.2	12	11.0	2	1.8	1	0.9	0	0.0	109	100.0	1.17
Human body waste	85	77.3	13	11.8	8	7.3	2	1.8	2	1.8	110	100.0	1.39
Theft of personal property	89	80.9	14	12.7	6	5.5	1	0.9	0	0.0	110	100.0	1.26
Navigation problems due to low water levels	76	74.5	16	15.7	3	4.9	2	1.9	3	2.9	102	100.0	1.43

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very serious problem		Totals		Mean scores
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Inadequate brochures showing map of river, hazards, access points, etc.	75	69.4	16	14.8	13	12.0	1	0.9	3	2.8	108	100.0	1.52
Unskilled floaters using river	72	66.7	13	12.0	13	12.0	6	5.6	4	3.7	108	100.0	1.67
Poor quality campsites	82	77.4	13	12.3	8	7.5	3	2.8	0	0.0	106	100.0	1.35
Current mining activities	90	82.6	14	12.8	0	0.0	4	3.7	1	0.9	109	100.0	1.27
Too many people using trails	78	71.6	21	19.3	6	5.5	3	2.8	1	0.9	109	100.0	1.42
Existing campsites overcrowded	72	67.3	18	16.8	12	11.2	4	3.7	1	0.9	107	100.0	1.54
Campsite locations not clearly identified	73	68.2	19	17.8	8	7.5	6	5.6	1	0.9	107	100.0	1.53
Inadequate no. of campsites	78	74.3	17	16.2	6	5.7	3	2.9	1	0.9	105	100.0	1.40
Inconsiderate floaters	68	74.3	20	19.6	3	2.9	4	3.9	7	6.9	102	100.0	1.64

TABLE 14A
OPEN ENDED RESPONSE TO PROBLEMS ON RIVER - BANK FISHERMEN

Response	Frequency
People Unfamiliar with Bear Trap	1
High Water	1
Rattlesnakes	1
Poor Road Conditions	1
Warm Water	2
Bank Markers Needed for Mileage	1
Too Many Recreational Floaters	1
Inconsiderate Recreational Floaters	2
Trailer Remaining at Campsites	2
Too Many Out of State Boaters	1
Out of Control Fire	1
	14

TABLE 15
ATTITUDES TOWARD MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Provide more points of public access to the river	41	37.3	26	23.6	15	13.6	25	22.7	3	2.7	110	100.0	2.30
Require more people to carry out their own trash	1	0.9	2	1.8	3	2.7	38	34.5	66	60.1	110	100.0	4.50
Provide more campsites along the river between put-in and take-out points	25	23.4	31	28.9	30	28.0	19	17.7	2	1.8	107	100.0	2.45
Prohibit motorized watercraft on the river	9	8.1	6	5.4	15	13.5	31	27.9	50	45.0	111	100.0	3.96
Post signs warning and advising of hazards	8	7.3	17	15.5	38	34.5	34	30.9	13	11.8	110	100.0	3.24
Provide more parking at access points	17	15.6	22	20.2	38	34.9	28	25.7	4	3.7	109	100.0	2.81

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Allow wood fires only at designated spots	11	9.9	27	23.3	18	16.2	40	36.0	15	13.5	111	100.0	3.18
Prohibit wood fires altogether	42	38.2	38	34.5	19	17.3	5	4.5	6	5.4	110	100.0	2.04
Provide more patrols to assist river users and enforce regulations	11	10.0	17	15.5	47	42.7	25	22.7	10	9.0	110	100.0	3.05
Develop short hiking trails at points along the river	14	12.6	22	19.8	38	34.2	33	29.7	4	3.6	111	100.0	2.91
Prohibit off-road vehicles in the vicinity of the river, except on roads and highways	7	6.3	7	6.3	14	12.6	33	29.7	50	45.0	111	100.0	4.00
Improve existing access roads to put-in and take-out points	14	12.7	19	17.3	38	34.5	29	26.4	10	9.1	110	100.0	3.01
Be more aggressive in the enforcement of safety rules and regulations	7	6.4	18	16.4	46	41.8	29	26.4	10	9.1	110	100.0	3.15

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Allow camping only at designated spots	16	14.4	26	23.4	26	23.4	28	25.2	15	13.5	111	100.0	3.00
Prohibit camping along the river	43	39.1	50	45.5	8	7.3	6	5.5	3	2.7	110	100.0	1.82
Restrict the numbers of people using the river at any one time	31	28.4	46	42.2	20	18.3	8	7.3	4	3.7	109	100.0	2.15
Allow unrestricted camping along the river	19	17.4	35	32.1	23	21.1	23	21.1	9	8.3	109	100.0	2.70
Provide campsites for river users at put-in and take-out points	9	8.2	15	13.6	29	26.4	49	45.4	8	7.3	110	100.0	3.29
Limit the number of people per group allowed on the river	14	12.7	42	38,2	35	31.8	10	9.1	9	8.2	110	100.0	2.61
Achieve better spacing among groups by assigning the time of day when each group may begin its trip	25	23.1	41	37.9	26	24.1	9	8.3	7	6.5	108	100.0	2.37

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Improve the loading areas at put-in and take-out points	9	8.2	17	15.5	55	50.0	27	24.5	2	1.8	110	100.0	2.96
Provide more information along the river identifying facilities and points of interest	8	7.3	20	18.2	45	40.9	32	29.1	5	4.5	110	100.0	3.05
Provide more distance markers along the river	12	10.9	23	20.9	35	31.8	33	30.0	7	6.4	110	100.0	1.10
Have each group be assigned where they are to camp	32	29.1	46	41.8	23	20.9	6	5.5	3	2.7	110	100.0	2.10
Restrict the number of floaters using the river	14	13.1	44	41.2	18	16.8	14	13.1	17	15.9	107	100.0	2.77

TABLE 16
OBSERVED CONFLICTS BETWEEN USER GROUPS

Groups	No Conflict Observed		Slight Conflict		Moderate Conflict		Serious Conflict		Very Serious Conflict		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Bank Fishermen and float fishermen	89	80.9	15	13.6	4	3.6	1	0.9	1	0.9	110	100.0	1.27
Recreational boaters (rafters, canoeists) and bank fishermen	72	65.5	14	12.7	17	15.5	6	5.5	1	0.9	110	100.0	1.63
Hikers and landowners	93	84.5	10	9.1	5	4.5	2	1.8	0	0.0	110	100.0	1.23
Recreational boaters (rafters, and canoeists) and float fishermen	86	78.9	11	10.1	11	10.1	1	0.9	0	0.0	109	100.0	1.33
Bank Fishermen and Hikers	105	94.5	4	3.6	1	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	110	100.0	1.05
Float Fishermen and Landowners	97	89.8	9	8.3	1	0.9	1	0.9	0	0.0	108	100.0	1.12
Different groups of trail users	100	92.6	8	7.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	108	100.0	1.07
Recreational boaters (rafters, and canoeists) and trail users	106	98.1	2	1.9	00	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	108	100.0	1.01

TABLE CONTINUED

Groups	No Conflict Observed		Slight conflict		Moderate Conflict		Serious Conflict		Very Serious Conflict		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Different groups of bank fishermen	90	81.8	16	14.5	3	2.7	1	0.9	0	0.0	110	100.0	1.22
Different groups of recreational boaters	89	82.6	14	12.7	3	3.8	0	0.0	1	0.9	108	100.0	1.24

TABLE 17
TYPES AND CAUSE OF CONFLICTS OBSERVED ON RIVER VISIT

Primary Conflicts	Frequency
Bank Fishermen vs Bank Fishermen	3
Bank Fishermen vs Float Fishermen	10
Rafters vs Bank Fishermen	7
Rafters	2
Teenagers vs Fishermen	2
Recreational Boaters vs All Fishermen	5
Fly Fishermen vs Bait Fishermen	2
Recreational Boaters vs Float Fishermen	1
Landowners vs Float Fishermen	3
Litter	1
	36

Primary Cause of Conflict	Frequency
Intoxication	3
Poor Manners by Float Fishermen	6
Crowding	3
Inconsiderate Behavior	13
Poor Boundary Lines	1
Disagreement Over Fishing Techniques	1
Inconsiderate Recreational Boaters	4
Lack of Information	2
	33

TABLE 18
USER SATISFACTION WITH RIVER TRIP

Satisfaction Measures	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neither Agree or Disagree		Agree		Strongly agree		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
I thoroughly enjoyed the trip	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	7.3	51	46.4	51	46.4	110	100.0	4.39
I was pleased by the job being done by the managers of the river	3	2.8	11	10.01	24	22.0	50	45.9	21	19.3	109	100.0	3.68
The river trip was well worth the money I spent to take it	0	0.0	3	2.8	17	16.0	46	43.4	40	37.7	106	100.0	4.10
I would like to come back and visit this river again	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.8	41	37.3	67	60.9	110	100.0	4.59

PART IV

BANK FISHERMEN PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS AND MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES

TABLE 19
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY FISHERMEN

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Not A Problem	1
Slight Problem	2
Moderate Problem	3
Serious Problem	4
Very Serious Problem	5

TABLE 20
ATTITUDES TOWARD FISHERY MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Strongly Oppose	1
Oppose	2
Neither Support Nor Oppose	3
Support	4
Strongly Support	5

TABLE 19
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY FISHERMEN

Problem	Not a Problem		Slight Problem		Moderate Problem		Serious Problem		Very Serious Problem		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Too few boat launch ramps	83	82.3	12	11.9	5	4.9	1	0.9	0	0.0	101	100.0	1.24
Too many commercially guided float fishing parties	61	59.2	16	15.5	10	9.7	9	8.7	7	6.8	103	100.0	1.88
Inadequate fishing regulation information along river	64	61.5	21	20.2	10	9.6	6	5.8	3	2.9	104	100.0	1.68
Too many private float fishing parties	73	70.9	16	15.5	9	8.7	4	3.9	1	0.9	103	100.0	1.48
Too many bank fishermen	74	69.8	24	22.6	8	7.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	106	100.0	1.37
Inadequate numbers of fish in river	62	58.8	26	24.5	12	11.3	3	2.8	3	2.8	106	100.0	1.66
Unskilled fishermen	74	69.8	20	18.7	7	6.6	2	1.9	3	2.8	106	100.0	1.49
Possession limits too restrictive	82	78.1	12	11.4	7	6.7	2	1.9	2	1.9	105	100.0	1.38

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem	Not a Problem		Slight Problem		Moderate Problem		Serious Problem		Very Serious Problem		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Inadequate fishing regulation brochure	69	66.3	21	20.2	10	9.6	2	1.9	2	1.9	104	100.0	1.52
Too many fishing wardens along river	98	92.5	3	2.8	4	3.8	0	0.0	1	0.9	106	100.0	1.14
Too many recreational boaters (rafters and canoeists)	58	55.2	22	20.9	14	13.3	6	5.7	5	4.8	105	100.0	1.83
Bait limitations (fly fishing only) are too restrictive	69	65.1	15	14.2	11	10.4	4	3.8	7	6.6	106	100.0	1.72
Catch and release sections are too long	70	66.7	19	18.1	7	6.7	5	4.8	4	3.8	105	100.0	1.60
Not enough large fish in river	54	51.4	20	19.0	17	16.2	7	6.7	7	6.7	105	100.0	1.98

TABLE 19A
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY BANK FISHERMEN

Problem	Frequency
Entire River Fly Fish and Catch and Release	3
Lower Madison Too Warm	5
Catch and Release Causing Fish Kill	1
Too Many Trash Fish	1
Poison Ivy	1
Not Enough Trophy Fish	2
Fishing Regulations Confusing	1
	14

TABLE 20
ATTITUDES TOWARD FISHERY MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Management Alternative	Strongly Oppose		Oppose		Neither Support Nor Oppose		Support		Strongly Support		Totals		Mean Scores
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Reduce length of fishing season	39	36.8	42	39.6	20	18.9	4	3.8	1	0.9	106	100.0	1.92
Provide more boat launch ramps	26	25.5	35	34.3	31	30.4	10	9.8	0	0.0	102	100.0	2.24
Increase possession limit numbers	33	31.1	34	32.1	24	22.6	12	11.3	3	2.8	106	100.0	1.94
Decrease possession limit numbers	19	18.1	38	36.2	31	29.5	13	12.4	4	3.8	105	100.0	2.47
Emphasize fish stocking program	21	19.8	15	14.2	26	24.5	32	30.2	12	11.3	106	100.0	2.99
Limit number of recreational boaters (canoeists and rafters)	10	9.6	27	25.9	36	34.6	21	20.2	10	9.6	104	100.0	2.94
Close more of river to float fishing	10	9.5	40	38.1	30	28.6	19	18.1	6	5.7	105	100.0	2.72

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternative	Strongly Oppose		Oppose		Neither Support Nor Oppose		Support		Strongly Support		Totals		Mean Scores
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Open more of river to float fishing	13	12.4	28	26.7	45	42.9	17	16.2	2	1.9	105	100.0	2.68
Limit commercially guided float fishing	2	1.9	9	8.6	34	32.4	38	36.2	22	20.9	105	100.0	3.65
Encourage commercially guided float fishing	92	27.6	47	44.8	26	24.8	2	1.9	1	0.9	105	100.0	2.03
Periodically close sections of the river to all types of fishing	15	14.3	21	20.0	35	33.3	28	26.7	6	5.7	105	100.0	2.89
Shorten catch and release sections	14	13.5	19	18.3	48	46.2	18	17.3	5	4.8	104	100.0	2.81
Shorten closed-to-fishing sections on river	4	3.8	21	20.2	51	49.0	23	22.1	5	2.8	104	100.0	3.03
Establish restrictive regulation sections on river (such as catch and release)	13	12.4	25	23.8	32	30.5	27	25.7	8	7.6	105	100.0	2.92

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternative	Strongly Oppose		Oppose		Neither Support Nor Oppose		Support		Strongly Support		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Stock river with more fish of all sizes	18	17.1	14	13.3	26	24.8	36	34.3	11	10.5	105	100.0	3.07
Limit number of bank fishermen	44	41.5	41	38.7	17	16.0	3	2.8	1	0.9	106	100.0	1.83
Manage for larger but fewer fish	15	14.3	37	35.2	29	27.6	18	17.1	6	5.7	105	100.0	2.64
Manage for more but smaller fish	16	15.2	41	39.0	41	39.0	7	6.7	0	0.0	105	100.0	2.37
Reduce number of private float fishermen on river	13	12.5	35	33.7	39	37.5	10	9.6	7	6.7	104	100.0	2.64
Prohibit use of natural baits	28	26.4	35	33.0	21	19.8	9	8.5	13	12.3	106	100.0	2.47
Expand fishing season	8	7.7	21	20.2	53	50.9	19	18.3	3	2.9	104	100.0	2.88

PART V
PERCEPTIONS OF BEAR TRAP CANYON MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

TABLE 21
STATUS OF BEAR TRAP CANYON TRAIL

Should the Bear Trap Canyon Trail Be

Option	Frequency	Percent
Reopened	36	34.6
Closed	57	54.8
No Opinion	11	10.6
	104	100.0

TABLE 22
STATUS OF BEAR TRAP CREEK CABIN

The Cabin Should

Option	Frequency	Percent
Be Removed	11	10.5
Be Uninhabitable	15	14.3
Remain As Is	65	61.9
No Opinion	14	13.3
	105	100.0

TABLE 23
FIRST VISIT TO BEAR TRAP CANYON

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	19	18.1
No	86	81.9
	105	100.0

TABLE 24

FREQUENCY OF VISITATION AT CANYON

Visits	Frequency	Percent
Once	9	10.2
2 - 4	41	47.2
5 +	37	42.6
	87	100.0

TABLE 25
NUMBER OF VISITS TO ROADLESS - WILDERNESS AREAS

Visits	Frequency	Percent
Once	16	15.5
2 - 4	34	33.0
5 +	53	51.5
	103	100.0

TABLE 26
LENGTH OF BEAR TRAP VISIT

Days	Frequency	Percent
1	75	70.8
Overnight	8	7.5
2+	23	21.7
	106	100.0

TABLE 27
SEASONAL VISITS TO BEAR TRAP CANYON

Visit Between October 1 and April 30

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	55	51.9
No	51	48.1
	106	100.0

PART VI

SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

TABLE 28
LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Grade Completed	Frequency	Percent
9	1	.9
10	0	0.0
11	3	2.7
12	22	19.9
College		
13	8	7.2
14	8	7.2
15	7	6.3
16	21	18.9
Post Graduate	41	36.9
	111	100.0

TABLE 29
AGE OF RESPONDENT

Age	Frequency		Percent
15-20	7		6.3
21-30	56		50.5
31-40	22		19.8
41-50	14		12.6
51-64	10		9.0
65+	2		1.8
	111		100.0
		Average Age	33.2
		St. Dev.	11.7

TABLE 30
GENDER OF RESPONDENT

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	103	92.8
Female	8	7.2
	111	100.0

FLOAT FISHERMEN

TABLE OF CONTENTS
for FLOAT FISHERMEN

SUBJECT TABLE NUMBER

PART I CHARACTERISTICS OF RIVER TRIP AND VISITORS

State of Residence 1
Month Respondent Contacted 2
Location of Interview 3
Put-In Locations 4
Take-Out Locations 5
Primary Watercraft 6
Equipment Ownership 7
Group Size 8
Camping on River 9
Respondents First River Visit 10
Frequency of Visitation 11
Length of River Visit 12

PART II PERCEPTIONS OF CROWDING

Estimated Number of People Seen by Float Fishermen

- People Observed at Put-In 13A
- People Observed at Take-Out 13B
- Float Fishermen Observed 13C
- Bank Fishermen Observed 13D
- Recreational Boaters Observed 13E
- Trail Users Observed 13F
- Campers Observed 13G

Expectations of Meeting Other Users 14
Desired Encounter Levels With Other Users 15

PART III USER PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS, MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES, CONFLICTS AND SATISFACTION

Problems Experienced on River 16
Open Ended Responses to Problems 16A
Attitudes Toward Management Alternatives 17
Observed Conflicts Between User Groups 18
Types and Causes of Conflicts Observed 19
User Satisfaction 20

PART IV FLOAT FISHERMEN PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS AND MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES

Problems Experienced by Fishermen 21
Open Ended Responses to Fishermen 21A
Attitude Toward Fishery Management Alternatives 22

SUBJECT TABLE NUMBER

PART V PERCEPTIONS OF BEAR TRAP CANYON MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Status of Bear Trap Canyon Trail 23
Status of Bear Trap Creek Cabin 24
First Visit to Bear Trap Canyon 25
Frequency of Visitation 26
Number of Trips to Roadless Area 27
Length of Bear Trap Visit 28
Seasonal Visits to Bear Trap Canyon 29

PART VI SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

Level of Education 30
Age of Respondent 31
Gender of Respondent 32

PART I

CHARACTERISTICS OF RIVER TRIP AND RIVER VISITORS

TABLE 1
STATE OF RESIDENCE FOR RESPONDENT

State	# of Respondents
California	14
Montana	5
Utah	3
Illinois	1
Oklahoma	1
	24

TABLE 2
MONTH RESPONDENT CONTACTED ON-SITE

Month	Frequency	Percent
June	7	30.4
July	12	52.2
August	4	17.4
	23	100.0

TABLE 3
LOCATION OF INTERVIEW

Location	Frequency	Percent
Warm Springs	20	83.3
Powerhouse	4	16.7
	24	100.0

TABLE 4
PUT-IN LOCATION

Location	Frequency	Percent
Powerhouse	24	100.0

TABLE 5
TAKE-OUT LOCATION

Location	Frequency	Percent
Warm Springs	24	100.0

TABLE 6
PRIMARY WATERCRAFT

Craft Type	Frequency	Percent
Rubber Raft	22	100.0
Miwok II	-	--
Kayak	-	--
Innertube	-	--
C-1	-	--
	22	100.0

TABLE 7
EQUIPMENT OWNERSHIP

Ownership	Frequency	Percent
Commercially Outfitted	19	79.2
Rented	-	--
Privately Outfitted	5	20.8
	24	100.0

TABLE 8
GROUP SIZE

Group Size	Frequency	Percent
2-3	7	31.8
4-6	11	50.0
7-9	4	18.2
10+	-	--
	22	100.0

TABLE 9
CAMPING ON RIVER

Camping	Frequency	Percent
Yes	-	--
No	23	100.0

TABLE 10
RESPONDENTS FIRST VISIT TO MADISON RIVER

First Visit	Frequency	Percent
Yes	6	25.0
No	18	75.0

TABLE 11
FREQUENCY OF VISITATION PER YEAR

Number of Visits	Frequency	Percent
1	6	33.3
2	4	22.2
3	-	-
4	-	-
5	-	-
6-10	8	44.5
11+	-	-
	18	100.0

TABLE 12
LENGTH OF RIVER VISIT

Days	Frequency	Percent
1	9	37.5
2	2	8.3
3-5	13	54.2
6-10	-	-
11+	-	-
	24	100.0

PART II

PERCEPTIONS OF CROWDING

TABLE 14
EXPECTATIONS OF MEETING OTHER USERS

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Far Fewer Than Expected	1
Fewer Than Expected	2
About What I Expected	3
More Than I Expected	4
Far More Than Expected	5
Had no Expectations	6

TABLE 15
DESIRED ENCOUNTER LEVELS WITH OTHER USERS

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Alot More People	1
A Few More People	2
Neither Fewer Nor More People	3
A Few Less People	4
Far Fewer People	5

TABLE 13A
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY FLOAT FISHERMEN

PEOPLE OBSERVED AT PUT-IN

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	3	14.3
1-2	1	4.8
3-5	5	23.9
6-10	4	19.0
11-15	3	14.3
16-20	4	19.0
21-25	1	4.7
26-50	-	-
50+	-	-
Mean 9.6	21	100.0
St. Dev. 7.6		

TABLE 13B
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY FLOAT FISHERMEN

PEOPLE OBSERVED AT TAKE-OUT

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	3	14.3
1-2	4	19.0
3-5	2	9.6
6-10	5	23.7
11-15	2	9.6
16-20	4	19.0
21-25	-	--
26-50	1	4.8
51+	-	--
Mean 8.5	21	100.0
St. Dev. 8.5		

TABLE 13C
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY FLOAT FISHERMEN

FLOAT FISHERMEN OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	10	43.6
1-2	1	4.3
3-5	2	8.7
6-10	1	4.3
11-15	3	13.0
16-20	4	17.4
21-25	-	--
26-50	2	8.7
51+	-	--
Mean 9.2	23	100.0
St. Dev. 11.9		

TABLE 13D
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY FLOAT FISHERMEN

BANK FISHERMEN OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	1	4.2
1-2	4	16.7
3-5	5	20.9
6-10	9	37.5
11-15	3	12.4
16-20	2	8.3
21-25	-	-
26-50	-	-
51+	-	-
Mean 7.2	24	100.0
St. Dev. 5.5		

TABLE 13E
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY FLOAT FISHERMEN

RECREATIONAL BOATERS OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	9	40.9
1-2	5	22.7
3-5	6	27.2
6-10	1	4.6
11-15	1	4.6
16-20	-	-
21-25	-	-
26-50	-	-
51+	-	-
Mean 2.2	22	100.0
St. Dev. 2.8		

TABLE 13F
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY FLOAT FISHERMEN

TRAIL USERS OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	11	55.0
1-2	2	10.0
3-5	5	25.0
6-10	1	5.0
11-15	1	5.0
16-20	-	-
21-25	-	-
26-50	-	-
51+	-	-
Mean 1.9	20	100.0
St. Dev. 3.1		

TABLE 13G
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY FLOAT FISHERMEN

CAMPERS OBSERVED

Number of People Observed	Frequency	Percent
0	5	62.5
1-2	1	12.5
3-5	2	25.0
6-10	-	--
Mean .6	8	100.0
St. Dev. .9		

TABLE 14
EXPECTATIONS OF MEETING OTHER USERS

Group or Location	How Did The Number of People Seen Compare to Your Expectations														
	Far fewer than expected		Fewer than expected		About what I expected		More than I expected		Far more than expected		Had no expect- ations		Totals		Mean* Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Put-In	2	8.7	1	4.3	10	43.5	2	8.7	3	13.0	5	21.8	23	100.0	3.17
Take-Out	2	8.7	1	4.3	10	43.5	4	17.4	2	8.7	4	17.4	23	100.0	3.16
Float Fishermen	4	17.4	5	21.7	5	21.7	4	17.4	3	12.9	2	8.7	23	100.0	2.86
Bank Fishermen	0	0.0	12	52.2	8	34.8	3	13.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	100.0	2.61
Recreational Boaters	4	17.3	7	30.4	7	30.4	1	4.3	0	0.0	4	17.4	23	100.0	2.26
Trail Users	8	36.3	4	18.2	4	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	27.3	22	100.0	1.75
People At Campsite	1	16.7	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	66.6	6	100.0	2.00

* Category "Had no expectations" was not used in calculating Mean Score.

TABLE 15
DESIRED ENCOUNTER LEVELS WITH OTHER USERS

Would Like to Have Seen

Group or Location	A lot more people		A few more people		Neither fewer nor more people		A few less people		Far fewer people		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Put-In	0	0.0	1	4.5	14	63.6	6	27.3	1	4.5	22	100.0	3.31
Take-Out	0	0.0	1	4.5	13	59.1	6	27.3	2	9.1	22	100.0	3.40
Float Fishermen	0	0.0	1	5.0	14	70.0	4	20.0	1	5.0	20	100.0	3.25
Bank Fishermen	0	0.0	1	4.5	19	86.4	1	4.5	1	4.5	22	100.0	3.09
Recreational Boaters	0	0.0	2	9.1	17	77.3	2	9.1	1	4.5	22	100.0	3.09
Trail Users	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	95.0	0	0.0	1	5.0	20	100.0	3.10
People at Campsite	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	83.3	0	0.0	1	16.7	6	100.0	3.33

PART III

USER PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS, MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES, CONFLICTS, AND SATISFACTION

TABLE 16
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED DURING RIVER VISIT

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Not A Problem	1
Slight Problem	2
Moderate Problem	3
Serious Problem	4
Very Serious Problem	5

TABLE 17
ATTITUDES TOWARD MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Strongly Oppose	1
Oppose	2
Neither Support nor Oppose	3
Support	4
Strongly Support	5

TABLE 18
OBSERVED CONFLICTS BETWEEN USER GROUPS

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
No Conflict Observed	1
Slight Conflict	2
Moderate Conflict	3
Serious Conflict	4
Very Serious Conflict	5

TABLE 20
USER SATISFACTION WITH RIVER TRIP

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Strongly Disagree	1
Disagree	2
Neither Agree of Disagree	3
Agree	4
Strongly Agree	5

TABLE 16
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED DURING RIVER VISIT

Problem Experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very serious problem		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Litter in or along a river	16	66.7	4	16.7	3	12.5	1	4.1	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.54
Obstructions in river (logs, limbs, fences)	20	83.3	3	12.5	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.20
Too few drinking water sources	17	73.9	4	17.4	1	4.3	1	4.3	0	0.0	23	100.0	1.39
Too many homes or cottages along the river	19	79.2	3	12.5	1	4.2	0	0.0	1	4.2	24	100.0	1.37
Off-road vehicles in river area	21	87.5	2	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.2	24	100.0	1.25
People being inconsiderate or making noise	29	79.2	1	4.2	3	12.5	0	0.0	1	4.2	24	100.0	1.45
Too many people floating on the river	15	62.5	1	4.2	3	12.5	4	16.7	1	4.2	24	100.0	1.98
Motorized boats on the river	22	95.6	0	0.0	1	4.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	100.0	1.08

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very Serious problem		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Utility poles and lines	21	87.5	3	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.12
Too many commercial establishments	21	87.5	3	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.12
Inadequate toilet facilities at put-in and take-out points	16	66.7	5	20.8	3	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.45
Too few toilet facilities along river between put-in and take-out points	18	75.0	4	16.7	2	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.33
Not enough law enforcement	19	79.2	2	8.3	2	8.3	0	0.0	1	4.2	24	100.0	1.41
Too much law enforcement	23	95.8	0	0.0	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.08
Roads within sight of river	19	79.2	4	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.1	24	100.0	1.33
Low flying aircraft	24	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.00

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very Serious problem		Totals		Mean scores
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Too many signs along river	23	95.8	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	.04
Too few signs along river	23	95.8	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.04
Inconsiderate bank fishermen	19	79.2	5	20.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.20
Inadequate information services (sign displays) at put-in points	18	75.0	5	20.8	0	0.0	1	4.2	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.33
Livestock	24	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.00
Human body waste	22	91.7	2	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.08
Theft of personal property	24	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.00
Navigation problems due to low water levels	12	50.0	8	33.3	4	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.66

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very serious problem		Totals		Mean scores
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Inadequate brochures showing map of river, hazards, access points, etc.	21	87.5	0	0.0	1	4.2	2	8.3	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.33
Unskilled floaters using river	16	69.6	4	17.4	2	8.7	0	0.0	1	4.3	23	100.0	1.52
Poor quality campsites	22	95.7	1	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	100.0	1.04
Current mining activities	20	86.9	2	8.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.4	23	100.0	1.26
Too many people using trails	20	91.0	1	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5	22	100.0	1.22
Existing campsites overcrowded	14	66.7	4	19.0	2	9.5	1	4.8	0	0.0	21	100.0	1.52
Campsite locations not clearly identified	20	95.2	1	4.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	100.0	1.04
Inadequate no. of campsites	19	90.5	2	9.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	100.0	1.09
Inconsiderate floaters	17	73.9	3	13.0	2	8.7	0	0.0	1	4.3	23	100.0	1.47

TABLE 16A
PROBLEMS OBSERVED DURING RIVER VISIT

Problems	Frequency
Warm Water	1
Inconsiderate Guides	2
	3

TABLE 17
ATTITUDES TOWARD MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Provide more points of public access to the river	16	66.7	4	16.7	3	12.5	4	4.1	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.54
Require more people to carry out their own trash	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.3	4	16.7	18	75.0	24	100.0	4.66
Provide more campsites along the river between put-in and take-out points	12	50.0	6	25.0	4	16.7	2	8.3	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.83
Prohibit motorized watercraft on the river	1	4.2	3	12.5	2	8.3	5	20.8	13	54.2	24	100.0	4.08
Post signs warning and advising of hazards	4	16.7	4	16.7	6	25.0	8	33.3	2	8.3	24	100.0	3.00
Provide more parking at access points	3	12.5	3	12.5	14	58.3	4	16.7	0	0.0	24	100.0	2.79

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Allow wood fires only at designated spots	3	13.0	0	0.0	4	17.4	10	43.5	6	26.1	23	100.0	3.69
Prohibit wood fires altogether	8	33.3	8	33.3	5	20.8	2	8.3	1	4.2	24	100.0	2.16
Provide more patrols to assist river users and enforce regulations	3	12.5	2	8.3	12	50.0	4	16.7	3	12.5	24	100.0	3.08
Develop short hiking trails at points along the river	7	29.2	5	20.8	3	12.5	8	33.3	1	4.2	24	100.0	2.62
Prohibit off-road vehicles in the vicinity of the river, except on roads and highways	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.3	12	50.0	10	41.7	24	100.0	4.33
Improve existing access roads to put-in and take-out points	5	20.8	1	4.2	9	37.5	6	25.0	3	12.5	24	100.0	3.04
Be more aggressive in the enforcement of safety rules and regulations	2	8.3	1	4.2	6	25.0	12	50.0	3	12.5	24	100.0	3.54

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Allow camping only at designated spots	2	8.7	2	8.7	3	13.0	10	43.5	6	26.1	23	100.0	3.69
Prohibit camping along the river	7	29.2	8	33.3	4	16.7	3	12.5	2	8.3	24	100.0	2.37
Restrict the numbers of people using the river at any one time	1	4.2	9	37.5	7	29.2	4	16.7	3	12.5	24	100.0	2.95
Allow unrestricted camping along the river	12	50.0	4	16.7	4	16.7	3	12.5	1	4.1	24	100.0	2.04
Provide campsites for river users at put-in and take-out points	5	20.8	5	20.8	5	20.8	8	33.3	1	4.2	24	100.0	2.79
Limit the number of people per group allowed on the river	3	12.5	4	16.7	7	29.2	8	33.3	2	8.3	24	100.0	3.08
Achieve better spacing among groups by assigning the time of day when each group may begin its trip	7	29.2	8	33.3	3	12.5	5	20.8	1	4.2	24	100.0	2.37

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Improve the loading areas at put-in and take-out points	2	8.3	2	8.3	8	33.3	7	29.2	5	20.8	24	100.0	3.45
Provide more information along the river identifying facilities and points of interest	7	30.4	8	34.8	5	21.7	3	13.0	0	0.0	23	100.0	2.17
Provide more distance markers along the river	7	29.2	6	25.0	7	29.2	4	16.7	0	0.0	24	100.0	2.33
Have each group be assigned where they are to camp	8	34.8	7	30.4	4	17.4	4	17.4	0	0.0	23	100.0	2.17
Restrict the number of floaters using the river	4	16.7	2	8.3	0	0.0	14	58.3	4	16.7	24	100.0	3.50

TABLE 18
OBSERVED CONFLICTS BETWEEN USER GROUPS

Groups	No Conflict Observed		Slight Conflict		Moderate Conflict		Serious Conflict		Very Serious Conflict		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Bank Fishermen and float fishermen	20	83.3	2	8.3	2	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.25
Recreational boaters (rafters, canoeists) and bank fishermen	18	75.0	5	20.8	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.92
Hikers and landowners	20	86.9	1	4.3	2	8.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	100.0	1.21
Recreational boaters (rafters, and canoeists) and float fishermen	17	70.8	6	25.0	0	0.0	1	4.2	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.37
Bank Fishermen and Hikers	22	95.6	0	0.0	1	4.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	100.0	1.08
Float Fishermen and Landowners	21	87.5	1	4.2	2	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.20
Different groups of trail users	23	95.8	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.04
Recreational boaters (rafters, and canoeists) and trail users	22	91.7	2	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.08

TABLE CONTINUED

Groups	No Conflict Observed		Slight conflict		Moderate Conflict		Serious Conflict		Very Serious Conflict		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Different groups of bank fishermen	22	91.7	2	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.08
Different groups of recreational boaters	22	91.7	2	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	24	100.0	1.08

TABLE 19
TYPES AND CAUSES OF CONFLICTS OBSERVED DURING RIVER VISIT

Primary Conflicts	Frequency
Bank vs Float Fishermen	1
Rafters vs Bank Fishermen	1
	2

Primary Causes	Frequency
Crowding	1
Inconsiderate Behavior	1
	2

TABLE 20
USER SATISFACTION WITH RIVER TRIP

Satisfaction Measures	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neither Agree or Disagree		Agree		Strongly agree		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
I thoroughly enjoyed the trip	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	16.7	20	83.3	24	100.0	4.83
I was pleased by the job being done by the managers of the river	0	0.0	1	4.2	2	8.3	10	41.7	11	45.8	24	100.0	4.29
The river trip was well worth the money I spent to take it	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.2	6	25.0	17	70.8	24	100.0	4.66
I would like to come back and visit this river again	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.2	23	95.8	24	100.0	4.95

PART IV

BANK FISHERMEN PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS AND MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES

TABLE 21
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY FISHERMEN

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Not A Problem	1
Slight Problem	2
Moderate Problem	3
Serious Problem	4
Very Serious Problem	5

TABLE 22
ATTITUDES TOWARD FISHERY MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Strongly Oppose	1
Oppose	2
Neither Support Nor Oppose	3
Support	4
Strongly Support	5

TABLE 21
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY FISHERMEN

Problem	Not a Problem		Slight Problem		Moderate Problem		Serious Problem		Very Serious Problem		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Too few boat launch ramps	16	69.6	4	17.4	3	13.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	100.0	1.43
Too many commercially guided float fishing parties	11	47.8	7	30.4	2	8.7	0	0.0	3	13.0	23	100.0	1.34
Inadequate fishing regulation information along river	16	69.6	4	17.4	1	4.3	2	8.7	0	0.0	23	100.0	1.52
Too many private float fishing parties	17	73.9	3	13.0	1	4.3	1	4.3	1	4.3	23	100.0	1.52
Too many bank fishermen	19	86.4	2	9.1	0	0.0	1	4.5	0	0.0	22	100.0	1.22
Inadequate numbers of fish in river	17	73.9	2	8.7	1	4.3	3	13.0	0	0.0	23	100.0	1.56
Unskilled fishermen	16	72.7	5	22.7	1	4.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	22	100.0	1.31
Possession limits too restrictive	19	82.6	1	4.3	1	4.3	1	4.3	1	4.3	23	100.0	1.43

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem	Not a Problem		Slight Problem		Moderate Problem		Serious Problem		Very Serious Problem		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Inadequate fishing regulation brochure	18	78.3	2	8.7	2	8.7	1	4.3	0	0.0	23	100.0	1.39
Too many fishing wardens along river	22	95.7	1	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	100.0	1.04
Too many recreational boaters (rafters and canoeists)	20	86.9	2	8.7	0	0.0	1	4.4	0	0.0	23	100.0	1.21
Bait limitations (fly fishing only) are too restrictive	18	78.3	1	4.3	3	13.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	23	100.0	1.47
Catch and release sections are too long	17	73.9	3	13.0	3	13.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	100.0	1.39
Not enough large fish in river	12	52.2	3	13.0	4	17.4	2	8.7	2	8.7	23	100.0	2.08

TABLE 21A
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY FLOAT FISHERMEN

Problem	Frequency
Limit Guides to Local People	1
Lower Madison Too Warm	1
Too Many Trash Fish	1
Too Many Private Float Fishermen	1
	4

TABLE 22
ATTITUDES TOWARD FISHERY MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Management Alternative	Strongly Oppose		Oppose		Neither Support Nor Oppose		Support		Strongly Support		Totals		Mean Scores
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Reduce length of fishing season	5	21.7	11	47.8	5	21.7	2	8.7	0	0.0	23	100.0	2.17
Provide more boat launch ramps	6	26.1	10	43.5	3	13.0	2	8.7	2	8.7	23	100.0	2.30
Increase possession limit numbers	12	52.2	5	21.8	3	13.0	3	13.0	0	0.0	23	100.0	1.86
Decrease possession limit numbers	4	17.4	4	17.4	8	34.8	4	26.1	1	4.3	23	100.0	2.82
Emphasize fish stocking program	4	17.4	2	8.7	5	21.7	7	30.4	5	21.7	23	100.0	3.30
Limit number of recreational boaters (canoeists and rafters)	4	18.2	2	9.1	7	31.8	6	27.3	3	13.6	22	100.0	3.09
Close more of river to float fishing	12	54.5	3	13.6	5	22.7	2	9.1	0	0.0	22	100.0	1.86

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternative	Strongly Oppose		Oppose		Neither Support Nor Oppose		Support		Strongly Support		Totals		Mean Scores
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Open more of river to float fishing	0	0.0	2	8.7	11	47.8	6	26.1	4	17.4	23	100.0	3.52
Limit commercially guided float fishing	5	21.7	2	8.7	3	13.0	9	39.1	4	17.4	23	100.0	3.21
Encourage commercially guided float fishing	5	21.7	6	26.1	5	21.7	3	13.0	4	17.4	23	100.0	2.78
Periodically close sections of the river to all types of fishing	3	13.0	4	17.4	3	13.0	7	30.5	6	26.1	23	100.0	3.39
Shorten catch and release sections	6	26.1	3	13.0	8	34.8	4	17.4	2	8.7	23	100.0	2.69
Shorten closed-to-fishing sections on river	2	8.7	2	8.7	9	39.1	7	30.4	3	13.0	23	100.0	3.30
Establish restrictive regulation sections on river (such as catch and release)	2	8.7	2	8.7	5	21.7	8	24.8	6	26.1	23	100.0	3.60

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternative	Strongly Oppose		Oppose		Neither Support Nor Oppose		Support		Strongly Support		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Stock river with more fish of all sizes	3	13.6	1	4.5	4	18.2	10	45.4	4	18.2	22	100.0	3.50
Limit number of bank fishermen	7	31.8	5	22.7	8	36.4	1	4.5	1	4.5	22	100.0	2.27
Manage for larger but fewer fish	0	0.0	7	31.8	4	18.2	8	36.4	3	13.6	22	100.0	3.31
Manage for more but smaller fish	5	22.7	7	31.8	8	36.4	2	9.1	0	0.0	22	100.0	2.31
Reduce number of private float fishermen on river	6	27.3	7	31.8	4	18.2	3	13.6	2	9.1	22	100.0	2.45
Prohibit use of natural baits	3	13.6	5	22.7	2	9.1	7	31.8	5	22.7	22	100.0	3.27
Expand fishing season	4	18.2	6	27.3	10	45.5	0	0.0	2	9.1	22	100.0	2.54

PART V
PERCEPTIONS OF BEAR TRAP CANYON MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

TABLE 23
STATUS OF BEAR TRAP CANYON TRAIL

Should the Bear Trap Canyon Trail Be

Option	Frequency	Percent
Reopened	5	21.7
Closed	18	78.3
No Opinion	0	0.0
	23	100.0

TABLE 24
STATUS OF BEAR TRAP CREEK CABIN

The Cabin Should

Option	Frequency	Percent
Be Removed	3	13.0
Be Uninhabitable	17	30.4
Remain As Is	12	52.3
No Opinion	1	4.3
	23	100.0

TABLE 25
FIRST VISIT TO BEAR TRAP CANYON

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	11	47.8
No	12	52.2
	23	100.0

TABLE 26
FREQUENCY OF VISITATION AT CANYON

Visits	Frequency	Percent
Once	3	25.0
2 - 4	6	50.0
5 +	3	25.0
	12	100.0

TABLE 27
NUMBER OF VISITS TO ROADLESS - WILDERNESS AREA

Visits	Frequency	Percent
Once	10	45.6
2 - 4	6	27.2
5 +	6	27.2
	22	100.0

TABLE 28
LENGTH OF BEAR TRAP VISIT

Days	Frequency	Percent
1	21	91.4
Overnight	1	4.3
2 +	1	4.3
	23	100.0

TABLE 29
SEASONAL VISITS TO BEAR TRAP CANYON

Visit Between October 1 and April 30

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	7	30.4
No	16	69.6
	23	100.0

PART VI

SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

TABLE 30
LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Grade Completed	Frequency	Percent
9	0	0.0
10	1	4.5
11	0	0.0
12	3	13.6
College		
13	2	9.1
14	2	9.1
15	2	9.1
16	4	18.2
Post Graduate	8	36.4
	22	100.0

TABLE 31
AGE OF RESPONDENT

Age	Frequency	Percent
15-20	3	13.0
21-30	5	21.6
31-40	4	17.6
41-50	7	30.2
51-64	4	17.6
65+	0	0.0
	23	100.0

Average Age 37.9
St. Dev. 14.1

TABLE 32
GENDER OF RESPONDENT

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	17	73.9
Female	6	26.1
	23	100.0

RECREATIONAL BOATERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS
for RECREATIONAL BOATERS

SUBJECT — TABLE NUMBER

PART I CHARACTERISTICS OF RIVER TRIP AND VISITORS

State of Residence for Respondents 1
Month of On-Site Contact 2
Location of Interview 3
Put-In Locations 4
Take-Out Locations 5
Primary Watercraft 6
Equipment Ownership 7
Group Size 8
Camping on River 9
Campsite Location 10
Respondents First River Visit 11
Frequency of Visitation 12
Length of River Visit 13

PART II PERCEPTIONS OF CROWDING

Estimated Number of People Seen by Recreational Boaters

- People Observed at Put-In 14A
- People Observed at Take-Out 14B
- Float Fishermen Observed 14C
- Bank Fishermen Observed 14D
- Recreational Boaters Observed 14E
- Trail Users Observed 14F
- Campers Observed 14G

Expectations of Meeting Other Users 15
Desired Encounter Levels With Other Users 16

PART III USER PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS, MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES, CONFLICTS AND SATISFACTION

Problems Experienced During River Visit 17
Open Ended Responses to Problems 17A
Attitudes Toward Management Alternatives 18
Observed Conflicts Between User Groups 19
Types and Causes of Conflicts Observed 20
User Satisfaction 21

SUBJECT TABLE NUMBER

PART IV PERCEPTION OF BEAR TRAP CANYON MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Status of Bear Trap Canyon Trail 22
Status of Bear Trap Creek Cabin 23
First Visit to Bear Trap Canyon 24
Frequency of Visitation 25
Number of Trips to Roadless Area 26
Length of Bear Trap Visit 27
Seasonal Visits to Bear Trap Canyon 28

PART V SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

Level of Education 29
Age of Respondent 30
Gender of Respondent 31

PART I

CHARACTERISTICS OF RIVER TRIP AND RIVER VISITORS

TABLE 1
STATE OF RESIDENCE FOR RESPONDENT

State	# of Respondents
Montana	35
Colorado	5
Ohio	4
Iowa	2
Illinois	2
Minnesota	2
Missouri	2
Pennsylvania	2
Utah	2
Washington	2
Alaska	1
California	1
Indiana	1
Michigan	1
North Dakota	1
Nevada	1
South Dakota	1
Texas	1
Virginia	1
	67

TABLE 2
MONTH RESPONDENT CONTACTED ON-SITE

Month	Frequency	Percent
May	2	3.2
June	11	17.5
July	19	30.2
August	31	49.1
	63	100.0

TABLE 3
LOCATION OF INTERVIEW

Location	Frequency	Percent
Warm Springs	63	94.0
Trail Head	4	6.0
	67	100.0

TABLE 4
PUT-IN LOCATIONS

Location	Frequency	Percent
Powerhouse	51	76.1
Trail Head	3	4.5
Warm Springs	5	7.5
Falls Circle	8	11.9
	67	100.0

TABLE 5
TAKE-OUT LOCATIONS

Location	Frequency	Percent
Warm Springs	59	88.0
Trail Head	5	7.5
Red Mountain	3	4.5
	67	100.0

TABLE 6
PRIMARY WATERCRAFT

Craft Type	Frequency	Percent
Rubber Raft	40	64.5
Miwok II	1	1.6
Kayak	16	25.8
Innertube	4	6.5
C-1	1	1.6
	62	100.0

TABLE 7
EQUIPMENT OWNERSHIP

Ownership	Frequency	Percent
Commercially Outfitted	31	46.3
Rented	3	4.5
Privately Outfitted	33	49.2
	67	100.0

TABLE 8
GROUP SIZE

Group Size	Frequency	Percent
1	1	1.6
2-3	9	13.4
4-6	24	35.8
7-9	21	31.3
10+	12	17.9
	67	100.0

TABLE 9
CAMPING ON RIVER

Camping	Frequency	Percent
Yes	3	4.5
No	64	95.5
	67	100.0

TABLE 10
LOCATION OF CAMPSITE

Location	Frequency	Percent
Rapids	1	33.3
Warm Springs	1	33.3
River Bridge	1	33.3
	3	100.0

TABLE 11
RESPONDENTS FIRST VISIT TO MADISON RIVER

First Visit	Frequency	Precent
Yes	31	42.3
No	36	53.7
	67	100.0

TABLE 12
FREQUENCY OF VISITATION PER YEAR

Number of Visits	Frequency	Percent
1	9	25.7
2	5	14.3
3	7	20.0
4	7	20.0
5	2	5.7
6-10	5	14.3
11+	-	--
	35	100.0

TABLE 13
LENGTH OF RIVER VISIT

Days	Frequency	Percent
1	60	89.5
2	5	7.5
3-5	2	3.0
	67	100.0

PART II

PERCEPTIONS OF CROWDING

TABLE 15
EXPECTATIONS OF MEETING OTHER USERS

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Far Fewer Than Expected	1
Fewer Than Expected	2
About What I Expected	3
More Than I Expected	4
Far More Than Expected	5
Had no Expectations	6

TABLE 16
DESIRED ENCOUNTER LEVELS WITH OTHER USERS

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Alot More People	1
A Few More People	2
Neither Fewer Nor More People	3
A Few Less People	4
Far Fewer People	5

TABLE 14A
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY RECREATIONAL BOATERS

PEOPLE OBSERVED AT PUT-IN

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	15	25.4
1-2	12	20.3
3-5	12	20.3
6-10	11	18.5
11-15	4	6.9
16-20	4	6.9
21-25	-	-
26-50	1	1.7
51+	-	-
Mean 5.3	60	100.0
St. Dev. 6.4		

TABLE 14B
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY RECREATIONAL BOATERS

PEOPLE OBSERVED AT TAKE-OUT

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	7	11.9
1-2	8	13.5
3-5	17	28.8
6-10	11	18.6
11-15	7	11.9
16-20	4	6.8
21-25	3	5.1
26-50	2	3.4
51+	-	-
Mean 9.0	59	100.0
St. Dev. 9.2		

TABLE 14C
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY RECREATIONAL BOATERS

FLOAT FISHERMEN OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	36	60.0
1-2	9	15.0
3-5	6	10.0
6-10	8	13.4
11-15	-	-
16-20	1	1.6
21-25	-	-
26-50	-	-
51+	-	-
Mean 1.9	60	100.0
St. Dev. 3.4		

TABLE 14D
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY RECREATIONAL BOATERS

BANK FISHERMEN OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	12	19.8
1-2	19	31.2
3-5	19	31.2
6-10	7	11.3
11-15	3	4.9
16-20	1	1.6
21-25	-	-
26-50	-	-
51+	-	-
Mean 3.6	61	100.0
St. Dev. 3.9		

TABLE 14E
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY RECREATIONAL BOATERS

RECREATIONAL BOATERS OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	27	45.0
1-2	5	8.3
3-5	14	23.3
6-10	10	16.7
11-15	2	5.0
16-20	-	-
21-25	-	-
26-50	1	1.7
51+	-	-
Mean 3.5	59	100.0
St. Dev. 3.2		

TABLE 14F
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY RECREATIONAL BOATERS

TRAIL USERS OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	32	53.3
1-2	10	16.7
3-5	12	20.0
6-10	6	10.0
11-15	-	-
16-20	-	-
21-25	-	-
26-50	-	-
51+	-	-
Mean 1.9	60	100.0
St. Dev. 2.6		

TABLE 14G
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY RECREATIONAL BOATERS

CAMPERS OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	11	57.8
1-2	-	-
3-5	3	15.8
6-10	3	15.8
11-15	1	5.3
16-20	-	-
21-25	-	-
26-50	1	5.3
51+	-	-
Mean 4.8	19	100.0
St. Dev. 9.5		

TABLE 15
EXPECTATIONS OF MEETING OTHER USERS

	How Did The Number of People Seen Compare to Your Expectations														
Group or Location	Far fewer than expected		Fewer than expected		About what I expected		More than I expected		Far more than expected		Had no expect-ations		Totals		Mean* Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Put-In	6	10.0	7	11.7	32	53.3	7	11.7	1	1.7	7	11.7	60	100.0	2.81
Take-Out	3	5.0	7	11.7	28	46.7	13	21.7	3	5.0	6	10.0	60	100.0	3.11
Float Fishermen	8	14.0	18	31.6	20	35.1	2	3.5	0	0.0	9	15.8	57	100.0	2.33
Bank Fishermen	8	13.6	14	23.7	28	47.5	5	8.5	0	0.0	4	6.8	59	100.0	2.18
Recreational Boaters	10	16.9	14	23.7	27	45.8	3	5.1	1	1.6	4	6.7	59	100.0	2.47
Trail Users	9	15.5	17	29.3	20	34.5	4	6.8	0	0.0	8	13.8	58	100.0	2.38
People At Campsite	3	17.6	4	23.5	2	11.8	1	5.9	2	11.8	5	29.4	17	100.0	2.58

* Category "Had no expectations" was not used in calculating Mean Score.

TABLE 16
DESIRED ENCOUNTER LEVELS WITH OTHER USERS

Would Like To Have Seen

Group or Location	Alot more people		A few more people		Neither fewer nor more people		A few less people		Far fewer people		Totals		Mean score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Put-In	1	1.6	3	4.9	49	80.3	6	9.8	2	3.2	61	100.0	3.08
Take-Out	0	0.0	2	3.2	47	77.0	10	16.4	2	3.2	61	100.0	3.19
Float Fishermen	0	0.0	3	5.4	49	89.2	3	5.4	0	0.0	55	100.0	3.00
Bank Fishermen	0	0.0	4	7.1	48	85.7	4	7.0	0	0.0	56	100.0	3.00
Recreational Boaters	4	7.0	7	12.3	42	73.7	4	7.0	0	0.0	57	100.0	2.80
Trail Users	1	1.8	5	9.1	46	83.6	3	5.5	0	0.0	55	100.0	2.92
People at Campsites	0	0.0	1	5.5	12	66.7	5	27.8	0	0.0	18	100.0	3.22

PART III

USER PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS, MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES, CONFLICTS, AND SATISFACTION

TABLE 17
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED DURING RIVER VISIT

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Not A Problem	1
Slight Problem	2
Moderate Problem	3
Serious Problem	4
Very Serious Problem	5

TABLE 18
ATTITUDES TOWARD MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Strongly Oppose	1
Oppose	2
Neither Support nor Oppose	3
Support	4
Strongly Support	5

TABLE 19
OBSERVED CONFLICTS BETWEEN USER GROUPS

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
No Conflict Observed	1
Slight Conflict	2
Moderate Conflict	3
Serious Conflict	4
Very Serious Conflict	5

TABLE 21
USER SATISFACTION WITH RIVER TRIP

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Strongly Disagree	1
Disagree	2
Neither Agree of Disagree	3
Agree	4
Strongly Agree	5

TABLE 17
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED DURING RIVER VISIT

Problem Experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very serious problem		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Litter in or along a river	49	73.1	15	22.4	3	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.31
Obstructions in river (logs, limbs, fences)	55	82.1	10	14.9	2	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.20
Too few drinking water sources	56	84.8	8	12.2	2	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	66	100.0	1.18
Too many homes or cottages along the river	66	98.5	0	0.0	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.02
Off-road vehicles in river area	60	89.6	6	8.9	0	0.0	1	1.5	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.13
People being inconsiderate or making noise	63	94.0	2	3.0	2	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.08
Too many people floating on the river	57	86.4	8	12.1	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	66	100.0	1.15
Motorized boats on the river	63	95.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.0	1	1.5	66	100.0	1.15

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very Serious problem		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Utility poles and lines	56	83.6	7	10.4	3	4.5	1	1.5	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.23
Too many commercial establishments	64	97.0	1	1.5	0	0.0	1	1.5	0	0.0	66	100.0	1.06
Inadequate toilet facilities at put-in and take-out points	36	53.7	20	29.9	8	11.9	3	4.5	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.67
Too few toilet facilities along river between put-in and take-out points	54	81.8	10	15.1	1	1.5	1	1.5	0	0.0	66	100.0	1.22
Not enough law enforcement	64	95.5	3	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.04
Too much law enforcement	62	95.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	0	0.0	1	1.5	65	100.0	1.10
Roads within sight of river	58	86.6	5	7.5	4	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.19
Low flying aircraft	63	94.0	2	3.0	1	1.5	0	0.0	1	1.5	67	100.0	1.11

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very Serious problem		Totals		Mean scores
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Too many signs along river	66	98.5	2	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.01
Too few signs along river	59	90.8	4	6.2	2	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	65	100.0	1.12
Inconsiderate bank fishermen	66	98.5	0	0.0	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.02
Inadequate information services (sign displays) at put-in points	50	75.8	11	16.7	4	6.1	1	1.5	0	0.0	66	100.0	1.33
Livestock	67	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.00
Human body waste	62	92.5	4	5.0	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.08
Theft of personal property	66	98.5	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.01
Navigation problems due to low water levels	41	61.2	15	22.4	9	13.4	2	3.0	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.58

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very serious problem		Totals		Mean scores
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Inadequate brochures showing map of river, hazards, access points, etc.	46	68.8	12	17.9	6	8.9	2	2.9	1	1.5	67	100.0	1.50
Unskilled floaters using river	53	79.1	9	13.4	2	2.9	2	2.9	1	1.5	67	100.0	1.34
Poor quality campsites	60	90.9	4	6.1	2	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	66	100.0	1.21
Current mining activities	64	97.0	1	1.5	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	66	100.0	1.06
Too many people using trails	62	98.4	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	63	100.0	1.01
Existing campsites overcrowded	59	96.7	2	3.3	0	0,0	0	0.0	0	0.0	61	100.0	1.03
Campsite locations not clearly identified	55	90.2	5	8.2	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	61	100.0	1.11
Inadequate no. of campsites	57	93.4	4	6.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	61	100.0	1.06
Inconsiderate floaters	62	95.4	2	3.1	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	65	100.0	1.06

TABLE 17A
PROBLEMS OBSERVED DURING RIVER VISIT

Problems	Frequency
Moss in River	1
Poor Road Conditions	1
Poor Put-In Facilities	2
	4

TABLE 18
ATTITUDES TOWARD MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Provide more points of public access to the river	24	35.8	26	38.8	13	19.4	4	5.9	0	0.0	67	100.0	1.95
Require more people to carry out their own trash	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	4.5	25	37.3	39	58.2	67	100.0	4.53
Provide more campsites along the river between put-in and take-out points	11	16.9	15	23.1	27	41.5	12	18.5	0	0.0	65	100.0	2.61
Prohibit motorized watercraft on the river	5	7.5	4	5.9	7	10.4	21	31.3	30	44.8	67	100.0	1,21
Post signs warning and advising of hazards	7	10.4	12	17.9	13	19.4	30	44.8	5	7.5	67	100.0	3.20
Provide more parking at access points	3	4.5	13	19.4	29	43.3	16	23.9	6	8.9	67	100.0	3.13

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Allow wood fires only at designated spots	1	1.5	9	13.6	13	19.7	31	46.9	12	18.2	66	100.0	3.66
Prohibit wood fires altogether	8	12.3	28	43.1	21	32.3	5	7.7	3	4.6	65	100.0	2.49
Provide more patrols to assist river users and enforce regulations	6	8.9	12	17.9	32	47.8	15	22.4	2	2.9	67	100.0	2.92
Develop short hiking trails at points along the river	4	5.9	10	14.9	19	28.4	32	47.8	2	2.9	67	100.0	3.26
Prohibit off-road vehicles in the vicinity of the river, except on roads and highways	2	2.9	2	2.9	8	11.9	26	38.8	29	43.3	67	100.0	4.16
Improve existing access roads to put-in and take-out points	3	4.6	16	24.6	20	30.8	19	29.2	7	10.8	65	100.0	3.16
Be more aggressive in the enforcement of safety rules and regulations	4	5.9	5	7.5	36	53.7	21	31.3	1	1.5	67	100.0	3.14

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Allow camping only at designated spots	2	2.9	9	13.4	17	25.4	29	43.3	10	14.9	67	100.0	3.53
Prohibit camping along the river	9	13.6	33	50.0	17	25.8	5	7.6	2	3.0	66	100.0	2.36
Restrict the numbers of people using the river at any one time	9	13.4	26	38.8	15	22.4	13	19.4	4	5.9	67	100.0	2.65
Allow unrestricted camping along the river	9	13.6	29	43.9	16	24.2	10	15.1	2	3.0	66	100.0	2.50
Provide campsites for river users at put-in and take-out points	3	4.5	10	14.9	19	28.4	30	44.8	5	7.5	67	100.0	3.35
Limit the number of people per group allowed on the river	6	8.9	29	42.3	13	19.4	17	25.4	2	2.9	67	100.0	2.70
Achieve better spacing among groups by assigning the time of day when each group may begin its trip	12	17.9	26	38.8	17	25.4	10	14.9	2	2.9	67	100.0	2.46

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Improve the loading areas at put-in and take-out points	1	1.5	11	16.4	25	37.3	21	31.3	9	13.4	67	100.0	3.38
Provide more information along the river identifying facilities and points of interest	6	8.9	18	28.9	19	28.4	21	21.3	3	4.5	67	100.0	2.95
Provide more distance markers along the river	7	10.6	15	22.7	23	34.8	19	28.8	2	3.0	66	100.0	2.90
Have each group be assigned where they are to camp	8	11.9	27	40.3	20	29.9	9	13.4	3	4.5	67	100.0	2.58
Restrict the number of floaters using the river	15	22.4	27	40.3	9	1.4	9	13.4	3	4.5	67	100.0	2.43

TABLE 19
OBSERVED CONFLICTS BETWEEN USER GROUPS

Groups	No Conflict Observed		Slight Conflict		Moderate Conflict		Serious Conflict		Very Serious Conflict		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Bank Fishermen and float fishermen	62	96.9	2	3.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	64	100.0	1.03
Recreational boaters (rafters, canoeists) and bank fishermen	63	96.9	2	3.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	65	100.0	1.03
Hikers and landowners	64	98.4	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	65	100.0	1.01
Recreational boaters (rafters, and canoeists) and float fishermen	63	98.4	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	64	100.0	1.01
Bank Fishermen and Hikers	63	98.4	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	64	100.0	1.01
Float Fishermen and Landowners	64	98.5	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	65	100.0	1.01
Different groups of trail users	64	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	64	100.0	1.00
Recreational boaters (rafters, and canoeists) and trail users	64	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	64	100.0	1.00

TABLE CONTINUED

Groups	No Conflict Observed		Slight conflict		Moderate Conflict		Serious Conflict		Very Serious Conflict		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Different groups of bank fishermen	63	98.4	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	64	100.0	1.01
Different groups of recreational boaters	62	95.4	3	4.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	65	100.0	1.04

TABLE 20

TYPES AND CAUSES OF CONFLICTS OBSERVED ON RIVER VISIT

Primary Conflict	Frequency
Bank Fishermen vs Bank Fishermen	1
Rafters vs Bank Fishermen	1
Rafters vs Rafters	1
	3

Primary Cause	Frequency
Crowding	1
Inconsiderate Behavior	1
Inconsiderate Recreational Boaters	1
	3

TABLE 21
USER SATISFACTION WITH RIVER TRIP

Satisfaction Measures	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neither Agree or Disagree		Agree		Strongly agree		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
I thoroughly enjoyed the trip	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	26	38.8	41	61.2	67	100.0	4.61
I was pleased by the job being done by the managers of the river	0	0.0	4	5.9	17	25.4	28	41.8	18	26.7	67	100.0	3.89
The river trip was well worth the money I spent to take it	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.9	28	41.8	37	55.2	67	100.0	4.52
I would like to come back and visit this river again	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	4.5	20	29.9	44	65.7	67	100.0	4.61

PART IV
PERCEPTIONS OF BEAR TRAP CANYON MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

TABLE 22
STATUS OF BEAR TRAP CANYON TRAIL

Should The Bear Trap Canyon Trail Be

Option	Frequency	Percent
Reopened	21	33.9
Closed	29	46.8
No Opinion	12	19.3
	62	100.0

TABLE 23
STATUS OF BEAR TRAP CREEK CABIN

The Cabin Should

Option	Frequency	Percent
Be Removed	15	24.2
Be Uninhabitable	12	19.4
Remain As Is	30	48.4
No Opinion	5	8.0
	62	100.0

TABLE 24
FIRST VISIT TO BEAR TRAP CANYON

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	44	70.7
No	18	29.3
	62	100.0

TABLE 25
FREQUENCY OF VISITATION AT CANYON

Visits	Frequency	Percent
Once	2	11.1
2 - 4	13	72.2
5 +	3	16.7
	18	100.0

TABLE 26
NUMBER OF VISITS TO ROADLESS - WILDERNESS AREA

Visits	Frequency	Percent
Once	22	35.5
2 - 4	22	35.5
5 +	18	29.0
	62	100.0

TABLE 27
LENGTH OF BEAR TRAP VISIT

Days	Frequency	Percent
1	60	96.8
Overnight	2	3.2
2 +	0	0.0
	62	100.0

TABLE 28
SEASONAL VISITS TO BEAR TRAP CANYON

Visit Between October 1 and April 30

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	8	12.9
No	54	87.1
	62	100.0

PART V

SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

TRAIL USERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS
for TRAIL USERS

SUBJECT TABLE NUMBERS

PART I CHARACTERISTICS OF RIVER TRIP AND VISITORS

State Of Residence 1
Month Respondent Contacted 2
Location of Interview 3
Starting Point of Hike 4
Ending Point of Hike 5
Group Size 6
Camping on River 7
Campsite Location 8
Frequency of Visitation 9
Respondents First River Visit 10
Length of River Visit 11

PART II PERCEPTIONS OF CROWDING

Estimated Number of People Seen by Trail Users

  People Observed at Trail Head 12A
  People Observed along Trail 12B
  Bank Fishermen Passed 12C
  Boaters Observed 12D
  Campers Observed 12E
Expectations of Meeting Other Users 13
Desired Encounter Levels With Other Users 14

PART III USER PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS, MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES, CONFLICTS AND SATISFACTION

Problems Experienced During River Visit 15
Open Ended Responses To Problems 15A
Attitudes Toward Management Alternatives 16
Observed Conflicts Between User Groups 17
Types and Causes of Conflicts Observed 18
User Satisfaction 19

PART IV PERCEPTIONS OF BEAR TRAP CANYON MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Status of Bear Trap Canyon Trail 20
Status of Bear Trap Creek Cabin 21
First Visit to Bear Trap Canyon 22
Frequency of Visitation 23
Number of Trips to Roadless ARea 24
Length of Bear Trap Visit 25
Seasonal Visits to Bear Trap Canyon 26

SUBJECT		TABLE NUMBER
PART V	SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS	
	Level of Education	27
	Age of Respondent	28
	Gender of Respondent	29

PART I

CHARACTERISTICS OF RIVER TRIP AND RIVER VISITORS

TABLE 1
STATE OF RESIDENCE FOR RESPONDENT

State	# or Respondents
Montana	30
Colorado	2
Illinois	3
California	1
Indiana	1
Maryland	1
Minnesota	1
Ohio	1
South Dakota	1
	41

TABLE 2
MONTH RESPONDENT CONTACTED ON-SITE

Month	Frequency	Percent
May	8	21.1
June	21	55.3
July	8	21.1
August	1	2.5
	38	100.0

TABLE 3
LOCATION OF INTERVIEW

Location	Frequency	Percent
Warm Springs	3	7.3
Trail Head	38	92.7
	41	100.0

TABLE 4
STARTING POINT OF HIKE

Location	Frequency	Percent
Trail Head	38	92.7
Warm Springs	3	7.3
	41	100.0

TABLE 5
ENDING POINT OF HIKE

Location	Frequency	Percent
Powerhouse	3	7.3
Trail Head	38	92.7
	41	100.0

TABLE 6
GROUP SIZE

Group Size	Frequency	Percent
1	4	9.8
2-3	22	53.6
4-6	11	26.8
7-9	4	9.8
10+	-	--
	41	100.0

TABLE 7
CAMPING ON RIVER

Camping	Frequency	Percent
Yes	10	24.4
No	31	75.6
	41	100.0

TABLE 8
CAMPSITE LOCATION

Location	Frequency	Percent
Red Mountain	2	25.0
Log Cabin	6	75.0
	8	100.0

TABLE 9
FREQUENCY OF VISITATION PER YEAR

Number of Visits	Frequency	Percent
1	1	3.7
2	3	11.1
3	3	11.1
4	5	18.6
5	3	11.1
6-10	12	44.4
11+	-	--
	27	100.0

TABLE 10
RESPONDENTS FIRST VISIT TO MADISON RIVER

First Visit	Frequency	Percent
Yes	14	34.1
No	27	65.9
	41	100.0

TABLE 11
LENGTH OF RIVER VISIT

Days	Frequency	Percent
1	25	60.9
2	14	34.2
3-5	2	4.9
6-10	-	-
11+	-	-
	41	100.0

PART II

PERCEPTIONS OF CROWDING

TABLE 13
EXPECTATIONS OF MEETING OTHER USERS

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Far Fewer Than Expected	1
Fewer Than Expected	2
About What I Expected	3
More Than I Expected	4
Far More Than Expected	5
Had no Expectations	6

TABLE 14
DESIRED ENCOUNTER LEVELS WITH OTHER USERS

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Alot More People	1
A Few More People	2
Neither Fewer Nor More People	3
A Few Less People	4
Far Fewer People	5

TABLE 12A
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY TRAIL USERS

PEOPLE OBSERVED AT TRAIL HEAD

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	2	6.5
1-2	5	16.2
3-5	14	45.0
6-10	7	22.5
11-15	2	6.5
16-20	-	-
21-25	1	3.2
26-50	0	-
51+	0	-
Mean 5.5 St. Dev. 5.1	31	100.0

TABLE 12B
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY TRAIL USERS

PEOPLE OBSERVED ALONG THE TRAIL

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	4	12.9
1-2	5	16.1
3-5	8	25.8
6-10	14	45.2
11-15	-	-
16-20	-	-
21-50	-	-
51+	-	-
Mean 5.2 St. Dev. 3.4	31	100.0

TABLE 12C
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY TRAIL USERS

BANK FISEHRMEN PASSED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	2	6.5
1-2	7	22.5
3-5	10	32.3
6-10	10	32.3
11-15	1	3.2
16-20	-	-
21-25	-	-
26-50	-	-
51+	1	3.2
Mean 7.0	31	100.0
St. Dev. 11.4		

TABLE 12D
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY TRAIL USERS

BOATERS OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	19	65.5
1-2	3	10.4
3-5	3	10.4
6-10	1	3.4
11-15	1	3.4
16-20	1	3.4
21-25	-	-
26-50	-	-
51+	1	3.4
Mean 4.3	29	100.0
St. Dev. 12.7		

TABLE 12E
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PEOPLE SEEN BY TRAIL USERS

CAMPERS OBSERVED

Number of People Seen	Frequency	Percent
0	5	41.7
1-2	1	8.3
3-5	2	16.7
6-10	1	8.3
11-15	2	16.7
16-20	-	-
21-25	-	-
26-50	1	8.3
51+	-	-
Mean 6.3	12	100.0
St. Dev. 9.8		

TABLE 13
EXPECTATIONS OF MEETING OTHER USERS

Group or Location	How Did the Number of People Seen Compare to Your Expectations														
	Far fewer than expected		Fewer than expected		About what I expected		More than I expected		Far more than expected		Had no expectations		Totals		Mean* Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
At Trailhead	1	3.2	3	9.7	16	51.6	4	12.9	2	6.5	5	16.1	31	100.0	3.12
Along the Trail	2	6.5	7	22.6	13	41.9	4	12.9	1	3.2	4	12.9	31	100.0	2.81
Bank Fishermen	0	0.0	9	29.0	15	48.4	2	6.5	2	6.5	3	9.7	31	100.0	2.89
Boater	4	13.3	5	16.7	9	30.0	1	3.3	0	0.0	11	36.7	30	100.0	2.37
People at Campsite	2	11.1	2	11.1	6	33.3	0	0.0	2	11.1	6	33.3	18	100.0	2.83

* Category "Had no expectations" was not used in calculating Mean Score.

TABLE 14
DESIRED ENCOUNTER LEVELS WITH OTHER USERS

Would Like To Have Seen

Group or Location	Alot more people		A few more people		Neither fewer nor more people		A few less people		Far fewer people		Totals		Mean score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
At Trailhead	1	3.3	0	0.0	24	80.0	1	3.3	4	13.3	30	100.0	3.23
Along the trail	0	0.0	1	3.4	22	75.9	3	10.3	3	10.3	29	100.0	3.27
Bank Fishermen	0	0.0	3	10.3	21	72.4	4	13.8	1	3.4	29	100.0	3.10
Boaters	0	0.0	2	6.9	27	93.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	29	100.0	2.90
People at Campsite	0	0.0	2	11.8	12	70.6	2	11.8	1	5.9	17	100.0	3.11

PART III

USER PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS, MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES, CONFLICTS, AND SATISFACTION

TABLE 15
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED DURING RIVER VISIT

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Not A Problem	1
Slight Problem	2
Moderate Problem	3
Serious Problem	4
Very Serious Problem	5

TABLE 16
ATTITUDES TOWARD MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Strongly Oppose	1
Oppose	2
Neither Support nor Oppose	3
Support	4
Strongly Support	5

TABLE 17
OBSERVED CONFLICTS BETWEEN USER GROUPS

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
No Conflict Observed	1
Slight Conflict	2
Moderate Conflict	3
Serious Conflict	4
Very Serious Conflict	5

TABLE 19
USER SATISFACTION WITH RIVER TRIP

CATEGORIES	CATEGORY RANK
Strongly Disagree	1
Disagree	2
Neither Agree of Disagree	3
Agree	4
Strongly Agree	5

TABLE 15
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED DURING RIVER VISIT

Problem Experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very serious problem		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Litter in or along a river	18	43.9	14	34.1	7	17.1	2	4.9	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.82
Obstructions in river (logs, limbs, fences)	28	73.7	7	18.4	3	7.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	38	100.0	1.34
Too few drinking water sources	23	56.1	7	17.1	11	26.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.70
Too many homes or cottages along the river	34	82.9	5	12.2	2	4.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.21
Off-road vehicles in river area	29	70.7	6	14.6	3	7.3	3	7.3	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.51
People being inconsiderate or making noise	33	80.5	5	12.2	1	2.4	2	4.9	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.31
Too many people floating on the river	29	70.7	8	19.5	2	4.9	2	4.9	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.43
Motorized boats on the river	36	87.8	2	4.9	2	4.9	0	0.0	1	2.4	41	100.0	1.24

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very Serious problem		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Utility poles and lines	31	75.6	8	19.5	1	2.4	0	0.0	1	2.4	41	100.0	1.34
Too many commercial establishments	38	92.7	0	0.0	2	4.9	0	0.0	1	2.4	41	100.0	1.19
Inadequate toilet facilities at put-in and take-out points	20	50.0	11	27.5	7	17.5	2	5.0	0	0.0	40	100.0	1.77
Too few toilet facilities along river between put-in and take-out points	24	61.5	9	23.1	5	12.8	1	2.6	0	0.0	39	100.0	1.56
Not enough law enforcement	35	85.4	4	9.8	1	2.4	1	2.4	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.21
Too much law enforcement	37	92.5	2	5.0	0	0.0	1	2.5	0	0.0	40	100.0	1.12
Roads within sight of river	29	70.7	8	19.5	4	9.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.39
Low flying aircraft	35	85.4	4	9.7	2	4.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.19

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very Serious problem		Totals		Mean scores
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Too many signs along river	36	87.8	3	7.3	2	4.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.17
Too few signs along river	38	95.0	1	2.5	1	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	40	100.0	1.07
Inconsiderate bank fishermen	37	90.2	3	7.3	1	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.12
Inadequate information services (sign displays) at put-in points	26	66.7	7	17.9	4	10.3	2	5.1	0	0.0	39	100.0	1.53
Livestock	34	87.2	1	2.6	3	7.7	0	0.0	1	2.6	39	100.0	1.28
Human body waste	33	82.5	5	12.5	0	0.0	1	2.5	1	2.5	40	100.0	1.30
Theft of personal property	36	87.8	4	9.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.4	41	100.0	1.19
Navigation problems due to low water levels	29	74.4	3	7.7	5	12.8	2	5.1	0	0.0	39	100.0	1.48

TABLE CONTINUED

Problem experienced	Not a problem		Slight problem		Moderate problem		Serious problem		Very serious problem		Totals		Mean scores
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Inadequate brochures showing map of river, hazards, access points, etc.	23	57.5	11	27.5	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	40	100.0	1.72
Unskilled floaters using river	28	75.7	7	18.9	2	5.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	37	100.0	1.29
Poor quality campsites	31	81.6	4	10.5	1	2.6	1	2.6	1	2.6	38	100.0	1.34
Current mining activities	29	73.4	3	8.1	3	8.1	2	5.4	0	0.0	37	100.0	1.40
Too many people using trails	34	82.9	2	4.9	4	9.8	0	0.0	1	2.4	41	100.0	1.34
Existing campsites overcrowded	27	67.5	7	17.5	4	10.0	1	2.5	1	2.5	40	100.0	1.55
Campsite locations not clearly identified	25	64.1	6	15.4	5	12.8	2	5.1	1	2.6	39	100.0	1.66
Inadequate no. of campsites	24	63.2	9	23.7	4	10.5	1	2.6	0	0.0	38	100.0	1.52
Inconsiderate floaters	29	74.4	6	15.4	3	7.7	1	2.6	0	0.0	39	100.0	1.38

TABLE 15A
PROBLEMS OBSERVED DURING RIVER VISIT

Problem	Frequency
Trail Flooded	3
Poison Ivy	3
Inconsiderate Recreational Floaters	1
	7

TABLE 16
ATTITUDES TOWARD MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Provide more points of public access to the river	16	41.0	10	25.6	9	23.1	2	5.1	2	5.1	39	100.0	2.07
Require more people to carry out their own trash	1	2.5	2	5.0	2	5.0	11	27.5	24	60.0	40	100.0	4.37
Provide more campsites along the river between put-in and take-out points	6	15.4	11	28.2	12	30.8	6	15.4	4	10.3	39	100.0	2.76
Prohibit motorized watercraft on the river	2	5.0	4	10.0	7	17.5	10	25.0	17	42.5	40	100.0	3.90
Post signs warning and advising of hazards	7	17.5	4	10.0	11	27.5	17	42.5	1	2.5	40	100.0	3.02
Provide more parking at access points	4	10.3	11	28.2	12	30.8	11	28.2	1	2.6	39	100.0	2.84

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Allow wood fires only at designated spots	2	5.0	15	37.5	4	10.0	13	32.5	6	15.0	40	100.0	3.15
Prohibit wood fires altogether	18	46.2	13	33.3	4	10.3	3	7.7	1	2.6	39	100.0	1.87
Provide more patrols to assist river users and enforce regulations	4	10.3	4	10.3	18	46.1	9	23.0	4	10.3	39	100.0	3.12
Develop short hiking trails at points along the river	2	5.1	5	12.8	9	23.1	16	41.0	7	17.9	39	100.0	3.53
Prohibit off-road vehicles in the vicinity of the river, except on roads and highways	1	2.5	2	5.0	5	12.5	10	25.0	22	55.0	40	100.0	4.25
Improve existing access roads to put-in and take-out points	5	12.5	9	22.5	9	22.5	10	25.0	7	17.5	40	100.0	3.12
Be more aggressive in the enforcement of safety rules and regulations	3	7.5	3	7.5	17	42.5	13	32.5	4	10.0	40	100.0	3.30

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Allow camping only at designated spots	6	15.0	14	35.0	5	12.5	11	27.5	4	10.0	40	100.0	2.82
Prohibit camping along the river	19	47.5	15	37.5	3	7.5	3	7.5	0	0.0	40	100.0	1.75
Restrict the numbers of people using the river at any one time	10	25.0	13	32.5	9	22.5	8	20.0	0	0.0	40	100.0	2.37
Allow unrestricted camping along the river	9	23.1	8	20.5	10	25.6	9	23.1	3	7.7	39	100.0	2.71
Provide campsites for river users at put-in and take-out points	2	5.3	5	13.2	9	23.7	19	50.0	3	7.9	38	100.0	3.42
Limit the number of people per group allowed on the river	4	10.0	12	30.0	14	35.0	8	20.0	2	5.0	40	100.0	2.80
Achieve better spacing among groups by assigning the time of day when each group may begin its trip	11	28.2	12	30.8	12	30.8	3	7.7	1	2.6	39	100.0	2.25

TABLE CONTINUED

Management Alternatives	Strongly oppose		Oppose		Neither support nor oppose		Support		Strongly support		Totals		Mean
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Improve the loading areas at put-in and take-out points	3	7.7	9	23.1	16	41.0	8	20.5	3	7.7	39	100.0	2.97
Provide more information along the river idnetifying facilities and points of interest	2	5.0	7	17.5	9	22.5	19	47.5	3	7.5	40	100.0	3.35
Provide more distance markers along the river	4	10.0	10	25.0	14	35.0	8	20.0	4	10.0	40	100.0	2.95
Have each group be assigned where they are to camp	13	32.5	19	47.5	5	12.5	3	7.5	0	0.0	40	100.0	1.95
Restrict the number of floaters using the river	7	17.5	12	30.0	11	27.5	6	15.0	4	10.0	40	100.0	2.70

TABLE 17
OBSERVED CONFLICTS BETWEEN USER GROUPS

Groups	No Conflict Observed		Slight Conflict		Moderate Conflict		Serious Conflict		Very Serious Conflict		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Bank Fishermen and float fishermen	39	95.2	1	2.4	1	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.07
Recreational boaters (rafters, canoeists) and bank fishermen	36	87.8	2	4.9	2	4.9	1	2.4	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.21
Hikers and landowners	39	95.1	1	2.4	1	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	41	100.0	1.07
Recreational boaters (rafters, and canoeists) and float fishermen	34	85.0	4	10.0	1	2.5	1	2.5	0	0.0	40	100.0	1.22
Bank Fishermen and Hikers	39	97.5	1	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	40	100.0	1.02
Float Fishermen and Landowners	40	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	40	100.0	1.00
Different groups of trail users	40	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	40	100.0	1.00
Recreational boaters (rafters, and canoeists) and trail users	39	97.5	1	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	40	100.0	1.02

TABLE CONTINUED

Groups	No Conflict Observed		Slight conflict		Moderate Conflict		Serious Conflict		Very Serious Conflict		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Different groups of bank fishermen	39	97.5	1	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	40	100.0	1.02
Different groups of recreational boaters	35	87.5	3	7.5	2	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	40	100.0	1.17

TABLE 18
TYPES AND CAUSES OF CONFLICTS OBSERVED ON RIVER VISIT

Primary Conflict	Frequency
Bank vs Bank Fishermen	1
Bank vs Float Fishermen	1
Rafters vs Bank Fishermen	1
Rafters vs Rafters	1
Hunters vs Landowners	1
Recreational Boaters vs All Fishermen	1
	6

Primary Cause	Frequency
Intoxication	1
Poor Manners by Float Fishermen	1
Inconsiderate Behavior	3
Boundary Problems	1
	6

TABLE 19
USER SATISFACTION WITH RIVER TRIP

Satisfaction Measures	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neither Agree or Disagree		Agree		Strongly agree		Totals		Mean Score
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
I thoroughly enjoyed the trip	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.5	13	32.5	26	65.0	40	100.0	4.62
I was pleased by the job being done by the managers of the river	0	0.0	1	2.6	11	28.2	24	61.5	3	7.7	39	100.0	3.74
The river trip was well worth the money I spent to take it	1	2.9	0	0.0	8	22.9	12	34.3	14	40.0	35	100.0	4.08
I would like to come back and visit this river again	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.4	11	26.8	29	70.8	41	100.0	4.68

PART IV

PERCEPTIONS OF BEAR TRAP CANYON MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

TABLE 20
STATUS OF BEAR TRAP CANYON TRAIL

Should the Bear Trap Canyon Trail Be

Option	Frequency	Percent
Reopened	13	31.8
Closed	27	65.8
No Opinion	1	2.4
	41	100.0

TABLE 21
STATUS OF BEAR TRAP CREEK CABIN

The Cabin Should

Option	Frequency	Percent
Be Removed	5	12.2
Be Uninhabitable	6	14.6
Remain As Is	30	73.2
No Opinion	0	0.0
	41	100.0

TABLE 22
FIRST VISIT TO BEAR TRAP CANYON

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	20	50.0
No	20	50.0
	40	100.0

TABLE 23
FREQUENCY OF VISITATION AT CANYON

Visits	Frequency	Percent
Once	1	5.2
2 - 4	12	63.2
5 +	6	31.6
	19	100.0

TABLE 24
NUMBER OF VISITS TO ROADLESS - WILDERNESS AREA

Visits	Frequency	Percent
Once	5	12.5
2 - 4	16	40.0
5 +	19	47.5
	40	100.0

TABLE 25
LENGTH OF BEAR TRAP VISIT

Days	Frequency	Percent
1	24	60.0
Overnight	20	25.0
2 +	6	15.0
	40	100.0

TABLE 26
SEASONAL VISITS TO BEAR TRAP CANYON

Visit Between October 1 and April 30

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	17	41.5
No	24	58.5
	41	100.0

PART V

SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

TABLE 27
LEVEL OF EDUCATION

Grade Completed	Frequency	Percent
9	0	0.0
10	0	0.0
11	1	2.5
12	7	17.5
College		
13	2	5.0
14	3	7.5
15	4	10.0
16	5	12.5
Post Graduate	18	45.0
	40	100.0

TABLE 28
AGE OF RESPONDENT

Age	Frequency	Percent
15-20	3	7.5
21-30	21	52.5
31-40	11	27.5
41-50	2	5.0
51-64	3	7.5
65+	0	0.0
	40	100.0

Average Age 30.5
St. Dev. 10.4

TABLE 29
GENDER OF RESPONDENT

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	23	57.5
Female	17	42.5
	43	100.0